

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

felurred mail UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/506,084	02/17/2000	Toshikazu Ohshima	2355.11106	7474	
5514 7	590 03/25/2002				
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO			EXAMINER		
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA NEW YORK, NY 10112			HARRISON, JESSICA		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,		3713		
				DATE MAILED: 03/25/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

APR 2 4 2002

TECHNOLOGY CENTER R0700

Office Action Summary

Application No. **09/506,084**

Applicant(s)

Ohshima et al.

Examiner

J. Harrison

Art Unit **3713**

	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	on the cover sheet with the correspondence address		
	for Reply			
THE N	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.			
af	ter SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communic	FR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed ation. , a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will		
be	considered timely.			
CO	mmunication.	period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this		
- Any ເ		statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any		
Status				
1) 💢	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>Jan 7, 20</u>	02		
2a) 💢	This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This act	ion is non-final.		
3) 🗆	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposi	tion of Claims			
4) 💢	Claim(s) <u>1-39</u>	is/are pending in the application.		
4	la) Of the above, claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration.		
5) 🗌	Claim(s)	is/are allowed.		
6) 💢	Claim(s) <u>1-39</u>	is/are rejected.		
7) 🗆	Claim(s)	is/are objected to.		
8) 🗆	Claims	are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.		
	tion Papers			
9) 🗌	The specification is objected to by the Examiner.			
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are	objected to by the Examiner.		
11)	The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a) \square approved b) \square disapproved.		
12)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exam	iner.		
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
13)💢	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign p	riority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).		
a) 🕽	☑ All b)☐ Some* c)☐ None of:			
	1. X Certified copies of the priority documents have	re been received.		
	2. \square Certified copies of the priority documents have	re been received in Application No		
	application from the International Bure			
	ee the attached detailed Office action for a list of th	·		
14)∐	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).		
Attachm	ent(s)	•		
15) 🔲 N	otice of References Cited (PTO-892)	18) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s).		
_	otice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	19) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)		
17) In	formation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	20) Other:		

Application/Control Number: 09/506084

Art Unit: 3713

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's amenement of Jan. 7, 2002 is acknowledged. Claims 1-39 remain pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-11, 14, 15, 17-19, 20-30, 33, 34, and 36 - 39 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Jarvik.

The rejection of the prior office action is maintained and repeated hereinbelow.

The Jarvik system integrates virtual reality with real-time sensed physical reality to provide a unique hybrid environment, as claimed in the instant claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3713

Claims 12, 13, 16, 31, 32, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jarvik.

The rejection of the prior office action is maintained and repeated hereinbelow.

Jarvik gives exercising examples, but suggests his systems use in a game environment. He does not explicitly state different types of games, such as recited in these claims. However, enemy games, fighting games, cooperative games, danger games, and the like are all well known genres of games, each having their own scoring schemes determined by game designers. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to adapt well known game genera and scoring schemes to the Jarvik system, in order to provide a variety of virtual experiences to the Jarvik system. Specific recitation of a type of score or game, when such are well known in the game art, would not serve to define patentability given the analogous technology and suggestions of game embodiments in Jarvik.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed January 7, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's sole point of contention hinges on applicant's assertion that the prior art reference to Jarvik fails to vary a virtual object based on a combination of a stored rule and the location/posture of a real object. In response, the examiner directs applicant's attention to Jarvik, col. 13, lines 5-60, (at least) and in particular lines 45 - 60. Clearly there is a "rule memory" in

Art Unit: 3713

Jarvik as he recognizes pedaling versus non pedaling, turning of handle bars versus turning of head, etc. and provides an appropriate visual display. Jarvik also teaches, for example, that algorithms to represent coasting may be incorporated, and that the computer is programmed to vary the playback rate of the video as a function of the pedal-speed. Clearly these are rule-based algorithms which, in combination with sensed location of a real object, vary the display or virtual object. Applicant's argument fails to persuade.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.



Art Unit: 3713

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to J. Harrison whose telephone number is (703) 308-2217.

jjh

March 21, 2002

JESSICA HARRISON PRIMARY EXAMINER